DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 392 FL 009 578

AUTHOR Stanley, Julia Penelope
TITLE Target Structure and Rule Conspiracies: Syntactic Exploitation.
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Theory of Rhetoric Conference. (Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 5-6, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjectives; *Discourse Analysis; English; Grammar; Language Research; *Language Styles; Linguistics; *Linguistic Theory; Nominals; Persuasive Discourse; *Phrase Structure; Speech Communication; Structural Analysis; *Surface Structure; *Syntax; Transformations (Language)

ABSTRACT

Any theory of stylistics sets itself the task of accounting for choices made by a speaker/writer among theoretically available and more-or-less equivalent linguistic structures. This task is a stumbling-block in the way of most attempts to construct a theory of style because there is no consistent method of defining 'available structures' and identifying 'equivalent structures.' Linguists have begun to apply the corollary concepts of 'target or surface structures' and 'rule conspiracies' to syntactic structures. This study concentrates on the uses of one such target structure in English, the MODIFIER + NOUN construction. Treating MODIFIER as a target 'slot,' it is noted that many different kinds of linguistic units can occupy it and that this 'attributive' slot is used to control the information available to readers/hearers. Choice of this target structure has three effects: (1) some information is deleted; (2) certain propositions can be buried, and (3) whatever occurs in that position is cast as 'attributive.' Using a transformational analysis to constrain the possible choices, and contrasting the MODIFIER + NOUN target with another, NOUN + MODIFIER, it is shown that 'equivalent structures' create stylistic differences not only in their effects on readers/hearers, but also in the kind and amount of information conveyed. (Author/AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

5-30-78

ED157392

Target Structures and Rule Conspiracies:

Syntactic Exploitation*

Julia Penelope Stanley
Department of English
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Julia Penelope Stanley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

*Paper delivered to Theory of Rhetoric Conference, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, May 5-6, 1978.

FL 009578

Abstract

Any theory of stylistics sets itself the task, either implicitly or explicitly, of accounting for choices made by a speaker/writer among theoretically available and more-or-less equivalent linguistic structures, whatever the level of those structures. However simple this task might seem at first, it is a stumbling-block in the way of most attempts to construct a theory of style. How can we usefully constrain the idea of choice when we have no consistent method of defining 'available structures' and identifying 'equivalent structures'?

Linguists have begun to apply the corollary concepts of 'target structures' and 'rule conspiracies' to syntactic structures. Simply defined, target structures are surface structures that may be produced by quite different rule conspiracies. However varied their derivational histories may be, these target structures look the same at the surface level. I have isolated one such target structure in English, the MODIFIER + NOUN construction. Although the implications of my research on this structure go beyond stylistics, I will concentrate on the uses of this construction. Treating MODIFIER as a target 'slot,' we find that many different kinds of linguistic units can occupy it, e.g., mere presence, rural sheriff, controlled society, navigable river, escaped convict, embarrassed silence, I will show how we use this 'attributive' slot to control the information available to our readers/hearers. Choice of this target structure

requires that we delete some information, and it has two other effects: (1) It enables us to bury certain propositions that cannot then be questioned, creating a 'discourse loop,' and (2) It casts whatever occurs in that position as 'attributive,' that is, as an inherent characteristic of the noun it modifies. Using a transformational analysis to constrain the possible choices, and contrasting the MODIFIER + NOUN target with another, NOUN + MODIFIER, I will show that 'equivalent structures' create stylistic differences not only in their effects on readers/hearers, but also in the kind and amount of information conveyed as well.

Any theory of stylistics, either implicitly or explicitly, sets itself the task of accounting for choices made by a speaker/writer among theoretically available and more-or-less equivalent linguistic structures, whatever the 'level' of those structures. However simple this task might seem at first, it is a stumbling-block for attempts to construct a theory of style. That is, the study of style entails prior considerations that link it directly to the concerns of linguistic theory. Without some fairly detailed description of the 'possible structures' in a specific language, the plausibility of describing certain features of syntax as 'choices' fades. The specification of choice depends upon an enumeration of the available structures from which a writer/speaker chooses. That is, we cannot usefully constrain the idea of choice when we have no consistent method of defining 'available structures' and identifying 'equivalent structures.' Unless we can specify 'available structures' and 'equivalent structures,' the idea of choice is vacuous and we remain at the taxonomic level where so much of the work on 'style' has been done for the past decade, or we have to be satisfied with crude quantitative statements about the 'percentage' of relative clauses or conjoined phrases. There is nothing inherently 'wrong' with such studies, if only because they provide us with data, but the information remains just that, uninterpretable data, until we have a theory of style that will provide an explanatory framework. At this time we have no way of

going from random observations about this writer or that text to valid generalization in our discussions of 'style,' because we cannot make explicit statements about the significance of specific choices. It is one thing to point to the use of syntactic structures in a text, but yet another to describe their contribution to the effects of the text. This paper is an attempt to describe one set of 'equivalent structures' that can be shown to have different motivations for their use, require different interpretive strategies of readers/listeners, and result in different 'meanings' in context. Furthermore, these equivalent structures can be distinguished from 'available structures' that resemble them at the surface structure level.

Using the notion of syntactic 'target structures' developed in Haiman (1974), I will be analyzing two surface structures in English syntax as target structures, Noun + Modifier (N + MOD) and Modifier + Noun (MOD + N). For lack of a less misleading terminology, I will use the label Modifier to emphasize one of the points of this paper, that what some linguists have regarded as members of the category 'adjective' are, in fact, very different kinds of structures and are 'adjectives' only to the extent that their surface structure position permits us to interpret them as such. MOD + N and N + MOD are target structures that are derived from various underlying structures by specific rule conspiracies. These two target structures can be defined as equivalent structures on the basis of shared transformational histories. Available structures

are those underlying structures that may, coincidentally, produce surface structures that appear to have the same derivation. The examples in (1) and (2) illustrate the various possibilities of the MOD + N and N + MOD target structures.

(1) a. her red hat
b. her rural hat
c. her sorry hat
d. her borrowed hat
e. her never-to-be-forgotten hat
f. her fluttering hat
g. her flowered hat

(2) a. her hat red with ribbons
b. her hat rural as it was
c. her hat sorry in the broad daylight
d. her hat borrowed from her sister
e. her hat never to be forgotten by anyone
f. her hat fluttering in the breeze
g. her hat flowered with a wide brim

If some of these NPs strike some as questionable or marginally acceptable, I should point out that I am not arguing degrees of acceptability.[1] In fact, perhaps the 'strangeness" of some of these NPs is due to our lack of awareness of them rather than to 'inherent' grammatical properties of specific lexical items. If

we define these target structures as highly productive surface positions in English, and accept some utterances that may strike us as 'strange' at first, we can construct a grammatical description that is maximally productive with fewer constraints on rule operations. My point here, however, is simply to isolate for descriptive purposes two frequent NP structures in English that can accommodate a variety of internal constructions. Both (1)a-c and (2)a-c, for example, are derived from an underlying NP with an embedded relative clause containing be + ADJ in the VP. (1)d-e and (2)d-e would be derived from an underlying passivized relative clause, (1) and (2)f would be derived from a relative clause with the progressive aspect, and (1) and (2)g would perhaps have an underlying structure represented as either 'a hat with flowers' or 'a hat that had flowers.'[2] Both of the target structures are, then, equivalent structures that can be directly related to each other by shared transformational rules. The transformational rules that produce the target structures are 'rule conspiracies,' that is, a specifiable series of transformations that operate on very different underlying structures. These underlying structures constitute the set of available structures from which we make stylistic choices.

In order to clearly distinguish between equivalent structures and available structures, perhaps another set of examples will help. The NPs in (3) illustrate equivalent structures; that is, each NP is related to the one immediately preceding it by a transformation.

(3) a. her car which was parked by her sister (Relative Clause)

b. her car parked by her sister (WHIZ-deletion)

c. her car parked (Agent-deletion)

d. her parked car (Adjective-movement)

(3)a is the most explicit version of the N + MOD target structure. (3)b is related to (3)a by WHIZ-deletion, (3)c to (3)b by Agent-deletion, and (3)d to (3)c by Adj-movement. The first three examples are N + MOD structures with varying amounts of information, and (3)d is a MOD + N target structure, derived from (3)c by Adj-movement. All four versions are equivalent structures because they are related to each other by consecutive transformational rules. Because they share the same underlying structure, they are derived from only one of several possible available structures that could have been chosen. The same target structures may, of course, be derived from different rule conspiracies, as the examples in (1) and (2) illustrate.

The two target structures I am analyzing create different readings, and it is the difference in readings that makes them stylistically useful. The N + MOD target forces a 'predicative' reading, while the MOD + N target forces an 'attributive' reading. Other linguists, most notably Bolinger, have used these interpretations as a basis for proposing that these structures are derived from different underlying structures. Bolinger (1967),

that the jewels stolen is purely predicative and the stolen jewels is unambiguously attributive, whereas the jewels are (were) stolen is ambiguous and can be interpreted as either predicative or attributive, i.e., as an 'adjective' or as a truncated passive construction. To the extent that such ambiguity is a substantial problem, it is the product of two possible rules, one a phrase structure rule (Pred ⟶ be + Adj), the other a transformational rule (the passive, with deletion of the agentive NP). The ambiguity of stolen in the declarative sentence is an interpretive problem; that is, if we are unsure whether to read stolen as predicative (truncated passive) or attributive (be + Adj) it is the result of the position of stolen in a target structure that could have been produced by two different kinds of rules. If we add information to these structures, it becomes obvious that the notional labels predicative and attributive apply only to surface structures.

(4) a. The jewels were stolen by a masked man.
b. The jewels were stolen recently.
c. The jewels are recently stolen.
d. The jewels stolen by a masked man
e. The jewels stolen recently
f. The recently-stolen jewels

(4)a, b, d, and e can be interpreted as predicative, that is, as truncated passives, whereas c. seems to be attributive, and f. is ambiguous with respect to interpretation.[3] The additional lexi-

cal information in these examples makes it clear that reading stolen as either predicative or attributive depends upon its position in surface structure rather than upon inherent features of the category ADJ or the derivational history of the sentences and phrases. As in the examples given in (3), the phrases and sentences in (4) are equivalent structures. Although be + ADJ is an 'available structure' in the grammar, it is not among the 'equivalent structures' of (4) which can be related by transformational rules. If others agree that surface structure positions create the possibility of specific readings, then it would seem that the best analysis would be one that describes such structures as targets that are selected in accordance with encoding strategies that serve stylistic ends.

If we assign the interpretations 'predicative' and 'attributive' to specific positions in a sentence, what kinds of encoding strategies might such target structures serve? The first is fairly obvious: Any lexical item moved into prenominal position, regardless of its derivational history, can then be read as attributive, as an 'inherent' feature of its head noun. The rule that enables us to move virtually any lexical item into prenominal position provides us with a way of making attributions to a noun that we cannot execute with any other rule. The peculiarities of the quantity and types of information this position can accommodate enhance its usefulness as a stylistic device. Consider, for example, the N[illegible]n (5).

(5) a. The jewels recently stolen by a masked man

b. The jewels recently stolen

c. The jewels recently stolen from my home

d. The jewels stolen by a masked man from my home

e. The jewels stolen by a masked man

f. The jewels stolen from my home

g. *The stolen jewels recently by a masked man

h. *The recently-stolen jewels by a masked man

i. *The recently-stolen jewels from my home

j. *The stolen jewels by a masked man

k. *The stolen jewels recently from my home

l. *The stolen jewels by a masked man from my home

m. *The stolen from my home jewels

n. *The stolen by a masked man jewels

o. The recently-stolen jewels

p. The stolen jewels from my home

Assuming that all of the examples in (5) are derived from the same underlying structure, a relative clause embedded under the head NP, the stylistic possibilities of the MOD + N target for the encoder are numerous, although limited. Examples (5)g.-n. illustrate that the information that can be moved into prenominal position is severely restricted, as are the kinds of information that can be left behind in postnominal position. In order for the derived target to be acceptable, only the major constituents of the relative

VP can be moved into prenominal position, including a single adverb, e.g., the recently-stolen jewels, the never-to-be-forgotten hat. Everything else, including the agent (unless it is a reflexive, e.g., self-constructed interpretations, self-saving devices, an object, e.g., face-saving behavior, mind-blowing experience) and other adverbial information, must be deleted prior to the movement rule. The amount of information that can be provided in the N + MOD structure is apparently unlimited and subject only to the motivations of the speaker. The contrast between the types and quantities of information that can be accommodated in the MOD + N and N + MOD target structures establishes the usefulness of these two targets with respect to the very different encoding strategies that they serve, and provides an explanation for the attributive interpretation characteristic of MOD + N and the predicative reading for N + MOD. Deletion of the copula, which carries tense, the agent, and various adverbial modifiers is optional with N + MOD, but usually obligatory for the MOD + N structure. The deletion of such information gives the prenominal modifier its 'attributive' interpretation. (6) illustrates the use of stolen in a context in which it is read as attributive in prenominal position, although the agent is clear from the context and tense is at least ambiguous.

(6) 'Renay, meet a good friend of mine, Vance Kenton, who owns this stolen scene out of Howard Pyle.' (Ann Shockley, Loving Her, p. 69).

How do these two target structures function in actual discourse situations? Let us consider first the various ways in which the N + MOD structure is used and the encoding strategies that it serves.[4] The quotations in (7) illustrate some of the modifying structures we find in postnominal position.

(7) a. A short, chunky woman, dressed in a brown pantsuit, with a broad square face capped with black hair streaked in the center by a narrow path of gray, came toward them, smiling widely.
(Ann Shockley, Loving Her, p. 69)

b. Connie leaned back, blowing smoke in Terry's direction. She had a model's face--features flawless, makeup perfect.
(Ann Shockley, p. 184)

c. I call them the perfect women, programmable, obedient, and beautiful.
(Bionic Woman, 10/27/76)

d. Reddish gold hair tumbled full down past high cheekbones, past huge eyes--. . .—dark eyes shadowed by paint and worry.
(Thomas Thompson, Blood and Money, p. 483)

e. This increase is dictated primarily by the fact the premiums deposited have not been sufficient to pay for the claims incurred within our program.

(Letter to employees from South Dakota Board of Regents, 6/76)

f. He lay with his ankles crossed, as if on a tomb.

(Nina Bawden, A Woman of My Age, p. 201)

g. . . .I hated to be hurt here, touched there--that it was astounding to find these prohibitions disregarded.

(Nina Bawden, p. 200)

h. There was no blood now, only a pinkish scum left behind.

(Nina Bawden, p. 204)

i. This was the sort of provocative reply which he found it very hard to check, and by which Nan was unfailingly provoked.

(Iris Murdoch, The Sandcastle, p. 12)

j. . . .well, you've not done so badly, all things considered.

(Nina Bawden, p. 221)

k. This was a moment fixed in time; something permanent.

(Nina Bawden, p. 204)

l. She was like something glimpsed just under the sea, some monster. . .

(Nina Bawden, p. 202)

m. Always rather fond of being liked, he developed a manner carefully blended of honesty and tact.

(John Fowles, The Ebony Tower, p. 14)

n. Nor was he the kind of person who was ashamed to think of his work in flats and homes, enjoyed privately, on his own chosen scale.

(John Fowles, p. 15)

o. Her hand reached toward a lamp by her side and from its conical hood a glare aimed down on her long figure and head, leaving the rest of the room untouched and unserved.

(Janet Flanner, The Cubical City, p. 4)

p. As she stared with drooping lids she saw this flatness already squared in space and hung with painted canvas.

(Janet Flanner, p. 5)

q. A silk tent, inflated.

(Janet Flanner, p. 6)

r. He cared principally for what he could achieve in his field, his pleasures mostly subjective, his virtues unobserved by

himself, and the recognition that came to him disdained when it was not disregarded.

(Elisabeth Craigin, Either is Love, p. 3)

s. She stood in the crowded room, undesired and undesiring.

t. Love was rare, and immortality was only a thing hoped-for, unproven and unprovable.

(Kilgore Trout, Venus on the Half-Shell, p. 34)

u. The grass was about two feet high, violet-colored and topped with yellow flowers with five petals.

(Kilgore Trout, p. 72)

v. He took at once to the quiet landscapes, orcharded and harvested, precise and pollarded, exhaling a spent fertility.

(John Fowles, The Ebony Tower, p. 3)

w. . . .this role she was to play, this being vaguely exploited, despised, suspicious, unwanted, tired, sunburned, so far from home; . . .

(John Fowles, p. 290)

This extensive series of quotations illustrates the wide variety of constructions that can occur in postnominal position, some marked by the authors as restrictive, others as nonrestrictive. Some are single modifiers, as in (7)b., e., f., and g., some are phrases,

as in (7)d., h., and m., while others contain a series of modifying structures, as in (7)a., c., i., and p. Two observations can be made regarding these structures, in addition to the more general comments already offered. First, the N + MOD target provides specific kinds of information to the reader, information that controls our interpretive processes because we are dependent upon what we are given through the eyes of the narrator/speaker. The information provided for us may be purely descriptive or pictorial, as in a., h., and o.; it can determine our judgment or interpretation of a character or that character's behavior, as in d., m., and r.; or it can serve to be both descriptive and prejudicial, as in b., c., and w. Second, the postnominal modifying position gives writers/speakers a contrastive environment in which they can multiply parallel structures for one of two purposes: To contrast two points of view with respect to the same information or to play off the diverse underlying structures against each other. The first possibility was used by Murdoch,

(8) . . .reply which he found it very hard to check, and by which Nan was unfailingly provoked.

while the second can be seen functioning in the following two quotations from Fowles, in addition to several of the others.

(9) a. . . .landscapes, orcharded and harvested, precise and pollarded, . . .

b. . . .vaguely exploited, despised, suspicious, unwanted, tired, sunburned, so far from home; . . .

In (8), although the information comes to us from a single point of view, we are given two perspectives of the character's reply. Because the observation represents a single point of view, we additionally find out that the first character is aware of the effect of his reply. The examples in (9) illustrate the explanatory usefulness of regarding N + MOD as a target structure that can be produced from diverse underlying structures. (9)a., for example, contains two truncated passives, harvested and pollarded, one denominal, orcharded, and one adjective, precise. The four together tell us what the character perceives as he looks at the landscapes and his judgment of them. (9)b. goes somewhat further in forcing us back and forth between pure description (sunburned), judgments about the character's environment (exploited, despised, unwanted), and judgments about her feelings (suspicious, tired). The final phrase, so far from home, is thus made ambiguous--it may be a purely descriptive statement or it may be a guess about her feelings. Yet another way of using these modifiers to bias readers' judgments about a character can be seen in (7)s,

(7) s. She stood in the crowded room, undesired and undesiring.

in which the truncated passive undesired describes the character in such a way that we approach our understanding of her as perhaps

unattractive (to whom?), 'plain,' (in whose terms?), or it could refer to her situation at that moment. The participle undesiring gives us contrasting information that purports to describe her internal psychological state with respect to those around her. The two predicates, thus set off against each other in our interpretive processes, almost simultaneously provide both external and internal information that we will use in our assessment of a particular character.

The encoding strategies served by the N + MOD target structure would seem to be the following: (1) To provide either purely descriptive or prejudicial information, or some combination of the two; (2) To contrast two different points of view with respect to the same information; or (3) To use the variety of available structures that produce the target structure to accomplish several of these aims simultaneously. Two features of the N + MOD target structure make it extremely useful as a means of accomplishing these encoding strategies: (1) It is embedded, which forces us to read the information as subordinate and, perhaps, additional; (2) It is unobtrusive because it is a common, frequently-used modifying structure. Both of these features make the N + MOD target structure a simple device for providing selective information in a way that doesn't call attention to itself.

Everything I have just described as encoding strategies that motivate the use of the N + MOD target structure hold true for the MOD + N structure with two significant additions. First,

the obligatory deletion of specific kinds of information prior to the movement transformation makes this a structure in which a writer/speaker can bury propositions that are not supposed to be questioned by the hearer/reader. Second, propositions that have been buried in prenominal position are usually interpreted as 'attributes' inherent to the noun head they modify. Furthermore, the MOD + N target structure serves to create a discourse loop for the reader/hearer. Because the proposition is buried in prenominal position, it cannot be questioned, and attention is focussed on the more obvious, 'major' predication of the sentences. The following quotations illustrate the usefulness of this target structure as a stylistic device.

(10) a. In his Brooks Brothers suit and high-sheen, tightly tied cordovans, he was almost alien,

. . .

(Thomas Thompson, p. 424)

b. The image was remarkable, coming as it did on a night when it was time to count bodies and wasted lives and the brutalities of abused power.

(Thomas Thompson, p. 509)

c. We were an old, safely married couple, our centrally heated house with books, whiskey, grubby paw-marks on the walls, was a refuge

for the battle-scarred. We listened to tales of betrayal and high-principled resolve.
(Nina Bawden, p. 189)

d. Above us, the shadowed mountains, purple and veridian, lifted into the pure sky.
(Nina Bawden, p. 196)

e. A few huddled figures rested against the parapet.
(Nina Bawden, p. 186)

f. The corkscrewed ends of her wormed hair soaked his paisley dressing-gown.
(Nina Bawden, p. 203)

g. She was lying on the crumpled towel.
(Nina Bawden, p. 204)

h. He gasped, twisting an unrecognizable face sideways.
(Nina Bawden, p. 204)

i. On one side of the square was a small, yellow-walled hotel.
(Nina Bawden, p. 222)

j. Twice he stopped and noted down particularly pleasing conjunctions of tone and depth--parallel stripes of watercolor with pencilled notes of amplification. . .
(John Fowles, p. 3)

k. . . . [she] smelled the odor cast off from early matinal rehearsals and the taint of the owner himself, smoking at her side in the imagined auditorium.

(Janet Flanner, p. 5)

l. Man is a very conditionable animal, . . .

(Conrad Lorenz, in an interview, Psychology Today, 11/74, p. 85)

m. The way they shot into a group of suspected unarmed students, . . .

n. Little is seen from a jumbled up puzzle.

o. I would like to begin with an unshackled account of my husband, . . .

(Elisabeth Craigin, p. 3)

p. . . .the struggle to escape from accomplished fact, . . .

(Elisabeth Craigin, p. 6)

q. I was the seared survivor of an earlier passion.

(Elisabeth Craigin, p. 9)

r. He had lost a beloved young wife in an unspeakable accident.

(Craigin, p. 9)

s. I refuse to deal with planted questions.

(Vice-Chancellor for Instruction, University of Nebraska, March, 1978)

t. No doubt many of the mentalistic expressions imbedded in the English language cannot be as rigorously translated as "sunrise," but acceptable translations are not out of reach. (B. F. Skinner, Beyond Freedom and Dignity, p. 24)

u. It may seem inconsistent to ask the reader to 'keep a point in mind' when he has been told that mind is an explanatory fiction, or to 'consider the idea of freedom' if an idea is simply an imagined precursor of behavior, . . . (Skinner, p. 24)

v. I keep it in my file for unanswered and/or unanswerable letters.

As was the case with the N + MOD structure, some of the MOD + N examples clearly serve a purely descriptive function, as in (10)a., d., and f. More often, however, the predications that have been buried in prenominal position serve to withhold information from the reader/hearer, as in m., q., and t., to protect the speaker in some way, as in o., t., and u., to enable the speaker to make accusations that cannot be questioned, as in b. and s., or to present information about characters that may or not be prejudicial, as in j. and k. As my examples show, several different rule conspiracies may operate to produce the MOD + N target structure. And, because of the speed with which we process linguistic material,

the variance in derivational histories will usually go unnoticed. This characteristic of the MOD + N structure makes it especially useful in a novel, where it can be used to impute emotional reactions and psychological states to characters without calling upon the conscious attention of the reader. The examples in (11) demonstrate this use by novelists.

(11) a. Richard was sprawled in an exhausted sleep.
(Bawden, p. 196)

b. I wanted to weep, but I felt nothing, only a generalized sadness.
(Bawden, p. 186)

c. An outraged voice spoke several loud, guttural words.
(Bawden, p. 184)

d. Mr. Hobb's lean, worried face bobbed against my vision.
(Bawden, p. 166)

e. Richard's puzzled look alarmed me.
(Bawden, p. 172)

f. She looked at me with comfortably accepted guilt, . . .
(Bawden, p. 197)

g. I felt horrified and guilty, but curiously calm--nothing, certainly, like the shocked desperation I felt I ought to feel.
(Bawden, p. 211)

h. There were two rather technical books about horses, but Penn, to the scandalized amazement of his English relatives. . .
(Iris Murdoch, An Unofficial Rose, p. 43)

i. [He regarded the possibility of being beaten] with a mixture of fear and thrilled awe.
(Murdoch, p. 45)

j. After his alarmed withdrawal coldness set in between them.
(Murdoch, p. 46)

k. After the violence of death, its unavoidable shock and horror, as his disturbed spirit began to compose into a fresh pattern, . . .
(Murdoch, p. 52)

Although a derivation can be proposed for some examples, such as (11)f., complete interpretation of the prenominal modifier is dependent upon information provided elsewhere in the text. Thus, for example, in order to interpret phrases like shocked desperation, scandalized amazement, thrilled awe, and alarmed withdrawal, we are forced back to the information given to us by the narrator or one of the characters, and any representation of underlying structure for such constructions will require using discourse information that is not intra-sentential. The MOD + N target structure, then, provides authors with a means of controlling our perceptions of characters and events that forces us to rely on the

narrator and other characters. What makes this a tricky stylistic device is not only its unobtrusiveness, but the kind of information we are given. That is, the emotional reactions and psychological states may or may not be accurately reported to us by the narrator or the characters, and we must then determine whether or not we trust the perceptions as they are presented to us. It is possible that this target structure provides us with clues regarding the trustworthiness of narrators and characters, accounts for our sudden shifts in loyalty to characters and reactions to their behavior, and may be the structural source of reinterpretations and reevaluations of preceding information.

The MOD + N target structure seems especially well-suited for serving specific encoding strategies of writers, in particular as a means of providing certain kinds of information to readers so unobtrusively that we process it unconsciously. This target structure may be one of the syntactic devices we've been seeking but not finding: The kind of syntactic structure that conveys interpretative information that we use in forming opinions about characters, whose effects are often called 'tone' and 'voice,' a structure closely connected to narration and point of view.

This paper has been largely exploratory, but I think it opens up a new area of inquiry for stylistics, one that may provide us with insights into the stylistic functions of syntax, connections between the micro-structures of texts and our interpretations of them, ways of explicitly defining such fuzzy notions

as 'tone,' 'point of view,' and 'narrative voice,' and clarification of the boundary between stylistics and linguistics. In addition, although I have only isolated two target structures here, others related to them immediately suggest themselves, e.g., the passivized prenominal modifier that functions as a noun after deletion of the head noun (the battle scarred [10c], the unhoped-for had happened), adverbs derived from passivized verbs (unexpectedly, determinedly, decidedly), and nominalized passives. Finally, as tentative as my analysis must be, it demonstrates the usefulness of analyzing surface configurations as target structures that are produced by various rule conspiracies, because the framework provides us with a way of defining both equivalent and available structures and distinguishing between them. Although much research remains to be done and there are many questions I have not addressed here, we may be able to construct a methodology within which we can meaningfully begin to talk about choice and stylistic options and their effects in literary discourse.

Endnotes

[1]I take the acceptability of some of these NPs to be a problem of print representation. That is, I have purposely omitted commas from my examples because I want it to be clear that I am talking about the structures as structures, regardless of typographical conventions. Commas would, of course, represent pitch and junctures that would be used for these structures in a speech situation. Since such typographical and phonological marking would be available to the speaker/writer, I don't think their omission here seriously affects my analysis of the structures.

[2]Contrary to contemporary transformational descriptions, I assume the validity of the analysis that would derive all of the examples in (1) and (2) from an underlying NP dominating an embedded relative clause ($_{NP}[S]_{NP}$). Although other linguists have argued, on the basis of well-formedness, that not all prenominal modifiers should be derived from underlying relative clauses, (e.g., the rural sheriff, but not *the sheriff rural; the sorry hat, but not *the hat sorry), I don't take the anomaly of such phrases as a serious reason for rejecting the derivation from relative clauses because, as my other examples demonstrate, the transformational process is otherwise productive. Furthermore, to argue that the relative clauses underlying some prenominal modifiers, e.g., the flowered hat, the walled garden, are problematic simply sidesteps the problems of accounting for such

modifiers in a principled way. If we analyze MOD + N more generally as a target structure in English, with the corollary that a target structure can be derived from several different rule conspiracies, we can account for more aspects of English usage with fewer rules without confusing our analysis of underlying structures with surface syntactic features.

[3]Examples (4)b. and c. indicate that tense plays some role in affecting the reading of stolen as predicative or attributive. Stolen in (4)b. is more readily interpreted as predicative because of the past tense, whereas in (4)c. the present tense seems to favor an attributive reading. The reasons for the influence of tense on interpretation are not at all clear to me and require more systematic investigation.

[4]Elsewhere I have explored some of the motivations that underlie uses of truncated passives (Stanley 1975; Stanley and Robbins, 1977, 1978, and forthcoming), passive adjectives (1972a), and nominalized passives (1972b), and I have offered tentative conclusions regarding the rhetorical usefulness of such constructions (Stanley 1976). Now, however, I think that treating these constructions as related target structures offers a more systematic and revealing analysis, and this paper is a first effort at such revision.

References

Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. Adjectives in English: Attribution and predication. Lingua 18.1-34.

Haiman, John. 1974. Targets and syntactic change. The Hague: Mouton.

Stanley, Julia P. 1972a. Syntactic exploitation: Passive adjectives in English. Paper delivered to Southeastern Conference on Linguistics, Athens, Georgia.

_____. 1972b. Nominalized passives. Paper delivered to Linguistic Society of America, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

_____. 1975. Passive motivation. Foundations of Language 13.25-39.

_____. 1976. The stylistics of belief. Teaching about doublespeak, ed. Daniel J. Dieterich, 175-87. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English.

_____, and Susan W. Robbins. 1977. Secret agents and truncated passives. Proceedings of the 1976 Mid-America Linguistics Conference, eds. Robert L. Brown, Jr., et al., 367-77. Minneapolis: Departments of English and Linguistics, University of Minnesota.

_____. 1978. Forced inference: Uses and abuses of the passive. Papers in Linguistics 10.299-311.

Stanley, Julia P., and Susan W. Robbins. Forthcoming. Agent recoverability and truncated passives. Forum Linguisticum.